

Conceptualising Intercultural Effectiveness for University Teaching

Nick Stone

This article focuses on one specific aspect of internationalisation in higher education: better understanding intercultural effectiveness so that university teachers can facilitate related student learning. It adopts an “actionable” definition of internationalisation to suggest ways to improve processes associated with the design, delivery, assessment, and evaluation of educational programs for the benefit of students from all backgrounds. Key terms and concepts are operationally defined, conceptual and applied issues are clarified, and some practical strategies are offered for staff who may be interested in improving international and intercultural dimensions of teaching in higher education.

Keywords: *internationalisation; cross-cultural; intercultural; higher education; university; global*

I will start by following the advice of Reginald Revans, the man who cleaned Einstein’s blackboard (Barker, 1998) and who attended weekly meetings to “barter ignorance” with Nobel laureates such as Francis Crick. Revans’s model of action learning originated in the 1940s through a request by the world’s largest group of employers at that time—coal mine owners—to provide an education plan for that industry. One of the core tenets of action learning is to develop better questions as a means of progressing learning, as opposed to the more common preoccupation of seeking “neat” answers (Crainer, 1996; Revans, 1987).

One of the most natural questions asked by academic staff—“What does internationalisation mean?”—invites seduction into a quagmire of potentially unsatisfying responses. As Minsky (1988) pointed out, the tendency of scientists to create and apply neat definitions on complex entities can sometimes do more harm than good, especially when labeling phenomena is mistaken for understanding what they are.

Instead of creating and applying neat definitions, this chapter attempts to follow some of Thomas Kuhn’s advice offered shortly before his death in 1996. Kuhn, interviewed by Horgan (1996), lamented the preoccupation of many scientists with

Journal of Studies in International Education, Vol. 10 No. 4, Winter 2006 334-356

DOI: 10.1177/1028315306287634

© 2006 Association for Studies in International Education

arriving at an absolute truth, a definitive theory, or an answer to conceptual problems. Instead, he advocated a more modest approach that acknowledges the interim nature of many advances in science and knowledge. At best, we can hope such advances help create a shared language, offer some additional conceptual clarity, and/or provide a useful step toward further knowledge creation or refinement (Bloom, 1956).

In the spirit of Revans, Kuhn, and Bloom, this chapter offers some conceptual and practical suggestions responding to some reframed questions. First, the question, "Why internationalise?" is explored by identifying some of the salient needs, pressures, and trends underpinning recent related rhetoric, policy, and realities. Next, the question, "What should internationalisation mean?" is addressed with specific reference to teaching and learning contexts. "How should we internationalise student learning?" is addressed through reference to promoting intercultural effectiveness (ICE) in ways that have been shown to be feasible for "normal," busy university teachers.

WHY INTERNATIONALISE?

In recent years, a number of well-documented pressures have combined to heighten the need for most people, regardless of their vocational, cultural, or geographical contexts, to learn to interact more effectively with others from different cultural backgrounds. These include the following:

- the advent of more globalised economies, markets, and international alliances;
- the rapid development of new information and communication technologies;
- vastly increased international mobility;
- the growing multicultural profile of most societies across the world; and
- the "internationalisation" of education programs and institutions.

The term *globalisation* is used widely to connote a range of meanings, including the justification of political and economic decisions (Balanyá, Doherty, Hoedeman, Ma'anit, & Wesselius, 1999; Saul, 1997). Related arguments discuss the nature and cost benefits of "borderless economies" and the rise of "global capitalism" (Korten, 1999). James (cited in Hong, Gibbons, & Schoch, 1999) described a more concrete indicator of the extent of globalisation. He suggested that Australia's integration into the global economy is very largely because of the onshore activities of multinational companies (MNCs) and pointed out that in recent years, "growth, in terms of revenue, profit, number of employees, and assets by MNCs far exceeded that of Australian listed companies" (Hong et al., 1999, p. 1). As it is used here, the term *globalisation* is used to describe the physical realities, rather than an ideological position, caused by such substantial increases in international economic interaction and interdependence.

The internationalisation of education, particularly higher education, is often associated with attracting foreign revenue to make up for reduced public sector funding. The level of ICE of marketing staff in host institutions has an obvious link with their success in attracting and catering for international students. Although getting international student “bums on seats” is a real challenge for most institutions, there are signs that the recent growth in international students cannot be sustained (Mazzarol, Soutar, & Seng, 2003). This enables us to consider other important aspects of internationalisation that transcend fiscal necessities, including the following:

- developing appropriate teaching methods, curricula, and support services for international and local students from diverse cultural backgrounds;
- identifying the benefits of international experience (e.g., exchange programs) for staff, students, and institutions; encouraging the uptake of these opportunities and finding ways to maximise and sustain these benefits over time;
- ensuring curriculum content and design is appropriate for graduates who will be operating in increasingly international environments;
- developing ICE levels of staff and students to facilitate positive social interaction and the development of productive and enduring professional relationships;
- the delivery of programs, collaboratively or unilaterally, either offshore or by distance-learning methods;
- the collaborative management of research and development/foreign aid programs by local and international partners; and
- providing opportunities for staff and students to develop “global citizenship” competencies, including an understanding of global issues and ways to actively engage in addressing them.

All of these needs require developing an understanding of the perspectives, values, and behaviours of other cultures. Most of them also demand a level of interpersonal ability to interrelate effectively with people from different cultures.

MAKING INTERNATIONALISATION “DOABLE”

The term *internationalisation* is used widely—if somewhat loosely—in higher education to connote a range of university goals and priorities. Hamilton (1998, p. 2) and the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee refer to it as “the complex of processes that gives universities an international dimension . . . relevant to . . . scholarship, teaching, research and institutional management.”

Given the broad range of activities that must fall within this category, it is understandable why they should choose such a definition. However, in order to take up the challenge of working within the more focused context of internationalising the student learning experience, there is a need to identify and adopt a higher

“resolution” interpretation of the second named component (teaching) that is more actionable.

The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC; cited in Knight, 1999) agreed on a rationale for internationalisation that offers a more practical basis for exploring possible responses to the above listed needs and pressures:

The objective is to prepare graduates who are

- internationally knowledgeable and
- interculturally competent.

These two constructs—international knowledgeability and intercultural competence—offer overlapping paths forward in responding to the need to internationalise student learning. The first construct is perhaps more tangible and easily understood, whereas the second is less so and consequently it is explored in considerably more detail below in the ICE section.

INTERNATIONAL KNOWLEDGEABILITY

International knowledgeability can also be considered as comprising the following two main elements:

- knowledge that pertains wholly or mainly to a specific nation or group of nations and
- global or generic knowledge that is broadly relevant and transferable across national borders.

The first category may relate to national features such as language, culture, economy, geography, architecture, and so on. The second category is seen to include a range of terms such as *world studies* (Pike & Selby, 1988), *global perspectives* (McCabe, 1997), *awareness* (Richards, 1994), *literacies* (Rosen, 2000), and *education* (McKenna, 2000). Some researchers disregard this sort of distinction between the two categories, preferring to group them together in lists of essential attributes for responding to increasing globalisation and internationalisation. Teichler (1999, p. 299), for example, listed a range of general and specific graduate attributes, emphasising the need for graduates to develop both an “understanding of various cultures” as well as “generic skills which cut across specific disciplines.” Similarly, Engler and Hunt (2004) saw a need to address glaring deficiencies in American students’ education as they are “dangerously uninformed about international matters” (p. 197).

Pike and Selby (1988) offered a more detailed and comprehensive taxonomy of educational objectives, which they consider important in preparing students for a world of increased global interdependence and interaction. An adapted, condensed version is included in Table 1, organised according to the familiar tripartite model—knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Although the depth and breadth of such

Table 1 Global Education Objectives**Knowledge**

- Personal: self-awareness, own perspective, how others see us
- Rights and responsibilities: prejudice and discrimination

Skills

- Interpersonal: assertiveness, empowerment, trust building, cooperation, negotiation, conflict management
- Discernment: decision making, ethical judgement, aesthetic appreciation
- Imaging: creative thinking, problem solving, perception of relationships, holistic perception, empathy, visualisation, forecasting

Attitudes

- Positive self-image: belief in own potential, genuineness, curiosity
- Appreciation of others: diversity, commonality, new perspectives
- Tolerance of uncertainty: ambiguity, insecurity, conflict, and change
- World-mindedness: respect for life, altruism

Source: Adapted from Pike and Selby (1988, pp. 63-69).

an inventory may seem overwhelming, it is not suggested that all teachers or courses should be trying to address any predetermined proportion of these objectives. Rather than being seen as a prescriptive syllabus, it should be valuable in identifying if and where it may be appropriate to include greater emphasis on particular global dimensions within the contexts of a wide range of curricula. It may, therefore, serve to stimulate ideas and suggest possibilities for internationalising student learning when curriculum review and development opportunities arise.

ICE

An operational definition for ICE is proposed here: “The ability to interact with people from different cultures so as to optimise the probability of mutually successful outcomes.”

The key terms included in this definition require explanation, as they have important implications for the ways in which ICE may be enhanced in teaching and learning settings.

**INTERCULTURAL, CROSS-CULTURAL,
OR TRANSCULTURAL**

Table 2 illustrates that “cross-cultural” results in 5 to 10 times more online key resource hits than “intercultural,” with “transcultural” located at a similar interval in third place. However, the term *intercultural* is used here in deference to the most

Table 2 Hits From Online Keyword Searches September 1, 2005

	Google	AOM	Proquest 5000	
			Full Search	Scholarly Journals Only
Cross-cultural	22,300,000	400	11,254	8,403
Intercultural	4,150,000	92	1,532	859
Transcultural	943,000	9	455	321

Note: Google search engine: www.google.com. AOM = Academy of Management Online Article Retrieval Service (<http://apps.aomonline.org/ArticleRetrieval/>). Proquest 5000 Academic Search Facility via University of Melbourne Library: <http://proquest.umi.com.mate.lib.unimelb.edu.au>.

widespread current conventions of the most relevant recent research, for example, the work of Gudykunst (1998), Wiseman and Koester (1993), and Samovar and Porter (1991). Although some perceive clear distinctions between these terms (Davies, 1997), in practice the terms are often used loosely and sometimes interchangeably. Choosing one or the other appears to be either a matter of local preference or a result of conventions specific to particular academic or vocational contexts. For example, the titles of two major journals that share a range of research areas related to ICE, but adopt different terms—the *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology* and the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. Meanwhile, psychiatric and nursing researchers seem to favour the term *transcultural* within their lingua franca. The range of terms and associated interpretations re-emphasises the importance of establishing clear working definitions to maximise the possibility of shared understandings for the potential audience of this study.

For the purposes of containing the focus to a manageable scope, the term *culture* is used here to connote the more traditional anthropological dimensions often related to race, ethnicity, and nationality, rather than other dimensions of social difference included in some definitions, such as organisational or institutional characteristics, age, socioeconomic status, sexuality, gender, or disability definitions (Queensland Department of Education, 1994). This definition is also in keeping with the most closely related research and literature that is concerned with an interpretation of culture relating to attributes passed down by tradition and that have developed over time (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, cited in Guirdham, 1999; *Macquarie Dictionary*, 1997, p. 529; Sorrells, 1998). It is acknowledged that there will continue to be common ground between the scope of this chapter and areas related to other sources of social difference, such as people who have disabilities or nonmainstream sexual preferences (Braithwaite, 1998; Majors, 1991).

In the past half century or so, there has been an acceleration in international mobility and interaction largely because of advances in technology related to

communications and transportation. As a result, “traditional” cultural boundaries and identities have become more blurred and difficult to separate. The question then arises: When is someone considered to be from a “different” culture? The response chosen here is commonly adopted by others also concerned with focusing on the practical edge of the field (e.g., Bennett, 1998) and, that is, when the difference is enough to cause significant misunderstanding or communication breakdown.

EFFECTIVENESS VERSUS COMPETENCE

Although (intercultural) *effectiveness* is a chosen key concept of this chapter, *competence*, which was preferred by the AUCC (Knight, 1999), is used widely in related literature. *Competence* is often seen as appropriate because it is understood by these users as a holistic concept that can be seen to encapsulate a range of attributes such as knowledge, attitudes, and skills considered essential for successful professional and personal performance (Gonczi, cited in Eraut, 1998).

However, the term and concept of *competence* has been strategically redefined for divergent purposes and by various stakeholder bodies. It has been variously seen as a tool to assure and manage quality in the workplace, inserted into formulae governing investment in “human capital,” and to provide what is perceived to be a more objective basis for the negotiation of a range of other industrial issues such as performance pay, skills formation, and greater accountability. In Australia, for example, the National Training Board (1992) attached parameters to the definition of *competence* that limited it to the workplace expectations identified by employers and other industry stakeholders.

Parts of the higher education sector, in Australia and the United Kingdom at least, have generally expressed scepticism about the usefulness of competency-based training, despite some potential perceived benefits to universities and professional bodies, such as

(being) better able to understand and articulate their professions . . . greater attention to the links between workplace performance and discipline-based knowledge, . . . address[ing] more concretely the attainment of underlying capacities of a generic kind and explicit consideration of the relation among all of these in curriculum development, teaching, and learning activities. (Bowden & Masters, 1993, p. ix)

Competence still tends to be associated by some with lower order skills training, perhaps because of “bureaucratic imposition of narrow perspectives” of competence (Bowden & Masters, 1993). More recently, others such as Talbot (2004), also from the medical profession, have also interpreted the term *competence* as part of “an inappropriate epistemology” (p. 587) that pertains to lower order abilities unable to capture important aspects of professional performance and understanding.

Along with others, the author argues that competency-based education and training can and should effectively foster the development of higher-order, meaningful, and transferable forms of learning. Its greatest advantage may be to enhance clarity of structure, order, and achievability of desired outcomes of educational programs. This allows greater levels of shared understandings, more systematic monitoring of performance progress, and a transparent hierarchy of components with which to more effectively plan, deliver, evaluate, and improve individual achievement and program design. Progressive competency-based approaches offer a means for much more clearly identifying what it is people need to learn, what steps are involved along the way, and how to know when progress has been achieved. Nevertheless, the less stigma-laden term *effectiveness* has been adopted here to circumvent possible concerns readers may have about the term *competence*.

MUTUALLY SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

The criterion “mutually successful outcomes” adds an important dimension and distinction to the definition of ICE. It implies a value stance that requires “concern for the other,” a key ingredient in authenticity of intercultural communication, a factor regarded as essential by Fox (1997), Adler (1995), and Gudykunst (1998), among others. This distinguishes ethical from potentially exploitative motivations for engaging in intercultural interactions: Some interpretations of ICE might allow for one party to achieve its own goals regardless of the consequences for, or even at the expense of, other parties. An extreme example might involve a Western business person applying some culture-specific knowledge in order to “dump” potentially harmful drugs, such as expired pharmaceutical products or low-grade tobacco, onto the markets of developing countries.

EXISTING RESEARCH INTO INTERCULTURAL EFFECTIVENESS

The study of ICE—which is often presented under the auspices of intercultural “communication” and intercultural “communication competence”—has only been regarded as a discrete area of study since the Second World War. At that time, the U.S. government sought to understand why their citizens were disliked by so much of the world (Hall, 1959). Since then, others such as Adler (1997) and Engler and Hunt (2004) have continued to express concern at the ethnocentrism and parochialism of U.S. education and research institutions. Researchers of ICE have tended to borrow and adapt approaches from several disciplines, including

- social and cross-cultural psychology;
- transcultural psychiatry;
- linguistics and communication theory;

- cultural anthropology;
- business management and international relations;
- sociology and political science, including postcolonialism;
- multicultural, migration, and population studies; and
- a range of theologically based approaches and purposes, such as missionary work.

Much of the research done to date has been aimed at investigating and describing various aspects or dimensions of cultural difference, for example, the works of Hall (1959), Hofstede (1980, 1991), and Trompenaars (1993). This work examines culturally derived patterns of behavioural difference relating to attitudes to time and space, verbal communication styles, group membership, and social power dynamics. This and other work provide useful frameworks to help raise awareness and expand understanding of specific aspects of cultural difference. Some specialists in this field provide inventories that are assumed to identify subjects' locations on various dimensions of intercultural sensitivity or awareness. The Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003), for example, is a recent manifestation of efforts to find a valid tool with which to measure aspects of an individual's intercultural development.

In many areas of education and training, there is a deficit of validated scales to support and measure the development of important abilities. To date, there seems to have been a marked reluctance by policy makers to commit to the systematic development and articulation of important developmental continua of learning. Some exceptions do exist, such as initiatives to develop student learning profiles (Rowe & Hill, 1996). This sort of work seems prerequisite if we are to achieve consistently high-quality educational programs. This involves clearly describing what it is we want people to learn, the stages of progress toward particular levels of performance, and how to assess key elements of the abilities concerned.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: ELEMENTS OF INTERCULTURAL EFFECTIVENESS

The existing literature has been reviewed to identify essential elements of ICE. Examples of elements identified by others are included in Table 3.

The following selection criteria were used to select and/or identify essential elements of ICE:

- They must appear consistently in the existing literature as important to ICE.
- They must be generic, as opposed to being specific to a certain culture or cultures or field of application.
- They are perceived to be relatively learnable, as opposed to innate/personality traits.
- The total set must be parsimonious but still take account of recent relevant research, such as emotional and cultural intelligences (Earley & Ang, 2003; Goleman, 1995).

Table 3 Examples of Elements Associated With Intercultural Effectiveness

Author/Title	Elements	
Arthur and Bennett (1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job knowledge and motivation • Family situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility/adaptability • Relational skills • Extra-cultural openness
Bennett (1986) Developmental model of intercultural sensitivity	Ethnocentrism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial • Defence • Minimisation 	Ethnorelativism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance • Cognitive adaptation • Behavioural adaptation
Earley and Ang (2003) Cultural intelligence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation • Cognition (including metacognition) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour
Chen (1997) Intercultural sensitivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-esteem • Self-monitoring • Open-mindedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empathy • Interaction involvement • Nonjudgment
Cui and van den Berg (1991)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication competence • Cultural empathy • Communication behaviour 	
Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman (1978)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dealing with psychological stress • Communication • Establishing interpersonal relationships 	
Hofstede (1980)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness • Knowledge • Skills 	
Kealey (1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation • Communication • Flexibility • Empathy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect • Tolerance for ambiguity • Self-confidence
Kelley and Meyers (1995) Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotional resilience • Flexibility/openness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptual acuity • Personal autonomy
Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) Criteria for acculturation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self • Relationship • Perceptual orientations 	
Ruben (1976) Seven dimensions of intercultural competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Display of respect • Interaction posture • Orientation to knowledge • Empathy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-oriented role behaviour • Interaction management • Tolerance for ambiguity

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Author/Title	Elements
Tucker (2000) Overseas Assignment Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expectations• Openmindedness• Respect for other beliefs• Trust in people• Tolerance• Personal control• Flexibility• Patience• Social adaptability• Initiative• Risk taking• Sense of humour• Interpersonal interest

The essential elements proposed here are

- emotional intelligence,
- knowledge,
- motivation,
- openness,
- resilience,
- reflectiveness,
- sensitivity, and
- skills.

There appear to be a number of logical ways to categorise these constructs. For example, in a broad sense of the word, *knowledge* could be seen as a coordinating, underpinning construct for all of the other elements. The behavioural application of these sorts of knowledge would then comprise a skills component (see Figure 1).

Some researchers have based their conceptual schemata on a single dominant construct underpinning all of these, such as sensitivity (Hammer et al., 2003) or “face negotiation” (Ting-Toomey, 1992) as lenses through, or with, which to organise other related aspects of ICE. Because of the complexity of the cognitive and affective traits involved, as well as their likely multiple interaction pathways, it seems improbable that any single model will emerge as a definitive choice for those working in this field. Instead, such models should be used for their contextualised utilitarian value.

The chosen elements appear consistently in a range of studies, although there is some inconsistency in the operational definitions of some terms. Hammer et al. (2003), for example, used the terms (*intercultural*) *sensitivity* and *competence* synonymously. For this reason, the working definition of each term is explained below. The categories below are not mutually exclusive. Empirical investigation




Figure 1. A Model of Intercultural Effectiveness

may suggest that some factors are more closely interrelated than others and may need to be collapsed under a single overarching construct. The list is not exhaustive and offers only one of many possible frameworks to conceive of and investigate ICE.

The intention here is to identify aspects of ICE perceived to be changeable through formal learning programs or other experiences. With this in mind, it is hoped that these constructs can form the basis for useful teaching, learning, and assessment processes. That is, they can be seen as developmental elements, as opposed to relatively fixed attributes (such as core personality traits) and can be described as continua along which performance and progress can be supported and monitored. These constructs have also been identified on the basis that they are generic, as opposed to some lists of attributes that are specific to particular cultures or purposes: for example, the ability to pursue business goals through engaging in tea ceremonies in Japan.

Emotional Intelligence

The term *emotional intelligence*—commonly referred to as EQ—is attributed to Salovey and Mayer (1990). It refers to an individual's awareness of the ways that emotional dynamics shape, influence, and are fundamentally important to decision-making processes and how they contribute to one's own and others' cognitive, affective, and behavioural responses. Recent advances in neural imaging technology suggest that affective processes have an essential role in psychological processes hitherto associated with "objective" mental domains such as effective learning, social interaction, and decision making (Goleman, 1995). There is growing evidence that cognitive processes, which have been historically considered separable from less "objective" or controllable impulses, are integrally intertwined with affective processes. Damasio (1996) rejected the Western scientific orthodox view that "the mechanisms of reason exist in a separate province of the mind,

where emotion should not be allowed to intrude” (p. xvii). He drew on a wide range of his own and others’ neurological studies to assert that “feelings are just as cognitive as other percepts” (Damasio, 1996, p. xvii).

The construct of EQ is closely related to “reflectiveness,” which provides a process for its development, particularly through increased self-awareness. It is given its own category because it has been largely underrepresented or ignored in many studies to date (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). It has also been given its “own space” because recent research suggests that it deserves a special emphasis because of its central importance in human abilities such as ICE, which might involve higher-than-normal levels of stress and anxiety (Gudykunst, 1998).

Knowledge

Knowledge here refers to prior learning that can be recalled or remembered (Bloom, 1956). The capacities to revise or modify prior learning and to learn (create new knowledge) are dependent on a number of factors including those below. Knowledge includes the following:

- declarative knowledge (e.g., knowledge that certain things exist or behave in certain ways);
- procedural knowledge (knowledge about how to do things, which underpins skills);
- culture-specific knowledge (e.g., knowing that a particular culture expects certain protocols in certain situations); and
- culture-general knowledge (e.g., about generic dimensions of cultural difference, such as collectivism-individualism, short- vs. long-term view, power distance, etc.).

Motivation

In this context, the term *motivation* refers to the “social goals and incentives” (Miller, 1984, p. 374), conscious and otherwise, driving people’s involvement with other cultures. This includes classical psychological constructs such as the affective-cognitive and intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomies. It also involves ethical dimensions, for example, the degree to which there is regard for the other’s welfare or aspects of justice or fairness. Motivation is likely to affect the levels of authenticity and honesty communicated in interactions, aspects seen by some as essential for ICE (Fox, 1997). Motivation is also intertwined with levels of enjoyment and the positive interest or regard that one experiences within intercultural encounters. It is easier to interact successfully if someone likes engaging, learning, and discovering with people from different cultural backgrounds.

Motivation is intertwined with personal value systems. Even highly trained actors may inadvertently show inner feelings that may conflict with attempts at incongruent external expressions (Damasio, 1996; Mestel, 1996). Hence, if someone is not being honest or transparent with respect to their intentions, or if there is

a conflict between espoused and practiced values, there is a higher probability that ICE will be negatively affected.

Openness

Openness, or “openmindedness” (Tucker, 2000), refers to the cognitive and affective flexibility (as opposed to rigidity) that allows the acceptance of cultural differences. Acceptance does not necessarily imply a high degree of agreement or comfort with these differences. Rather, it means that ethnocentrism or other constraining factors do not unduly interfere with successful interactions. Openness may involve suspending judgements, bracketing assumptions, or sidelining reservations to maximise the potential for success in a situation. For example, a difference of opinion may persist while accepting the legitimacy of a different way of thinking or acting. It encompasses the concept of polychotomous thinking, as opposed to uni- or bipolar mental rigidity. This means allowing for the existence of more than one or two categories with which to label objects, phenomena, or, more usually in intercultural situations, people.

It is normal and necessary for the human mind to reduce to a manageable quantity the number of ways of thinking about or explaining phenomena. Considered in this light, stereotyping is a natural coping mechanism when confronted with overwhelming or large amounts of information (Hilgard, Atkinson, & Atkinson, 1979). Openness helps to temper some possible negative effects of such reductionist categorisations by acknowledging that there are likely to be many more ways of thinking about or categorising phenomena than may initially be possible. It involves remaining open to additional information and the creation of new categories or subcategories and assuming that patterns of thought usually evolve into increasingly sophisticated schema and constructs. This involves accepting uncertainty and the anxiety that often accompanies it as natural accompaniments to learning and personal growth.

The converse of openness is to resist expanding category width (Hall, 1959) and to arrest learning by only acknowledging one or two ways of thinking about or doing something. Openness involves an acceptance that there are many ways to think about issues and ways of living, for example, including those that are as yet unknown to the perceiver and may never be. Therefore, there is an element of accepting uncertainty and managing the anxiety that sometimes naturally accompanies it. Although openness could be understood to refer to honesty or authenticity, these attributes are delegated to the motivation category above.

Resilience

Resilience has enjoyed a resurgence of research interest lately. Much of this work is concerned with identifying and strengthening factors considered to enhance protection against one's own or others' harmful behaviours, for example,

harmful drug use, violence and preventable mental health problems (Scales, 1999). However, the construct of resilience, which Kelley and Meyers (1995) termed *emotional resilience*, is also an essential aspect of ICE. The term *emotional* is not used here because resilience is considered to also include significant cognitive dimensions. Coping with stressful situations, recovering from setbacks, and maintaining a sense of self in conditions of high uncertainty are all-important qualities of ICE. Gudykunst's (1998) uncertainty/anxiety management theory is predicated on this class of dynamics. It is also conceptually highly related to affective-cognitive equilibrium.

Reflectiveness

Reflectiveness refers to the ability to reflect on experience and to then learn and improve from it. This may involve one's own behaviour, that of others, or more often, both. Reflectiveness is assumed to be a fundamental facilitator in improving ICE, as it is with other higher-order abilities. Systematic reflection on one's own ways of thinking, feeling, and doing can enhance the self-awareness that allows major progress in relating better to people of other cultures.

Reflectiveness allows knowledge to positively transform practice and vice versa. Ideally, it leads to enhanced understanding of what might have transpired below the surface of a particular situation and therefore how better to approach and engage in the next related encounter. Several layers may be ascribed to self-reflectiveness, ranging from simple reflection on what actually physically happened in a situation to reflection on deeper aspects such as moral dimensions of experience (Mezirow, 1988).

Sensitivity

Bennett (1998) used sensitivity as the central construct for his developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS). Subsequently, Hammer et al. (2003) extended the DMIS to construct the Intercultural Development Inventory, again using sensitivity as the umbrella construct under which to examine a continuum of variables that range from ethnocentric to ethnorelativistic levels. As it is used here, sensitivity is intended to connote the ability to be sensitive to cues that are often subtle or unfamiliar and to adjust behaviour and expectations accordingly.

The sensitivity element is also where the construct empathy is considered to fit most comfortably; however, it is acknowledged that empirical analyses may reveal it deserves a greater or lesser status in the hierarchy. Empathy relates to the ability to feel "for" or "with" or "to know how another person feels" (Goleman, 1995, p. 96) "while still maintaining some separateness" (Bolton, 1987, p. 271). Although it is probably impossible to feel exactly what someone else is feeling, the term is adopted here to describe the effort and effectiveness put into demonstrating a

concern for understanding another's feelings and situation. Roger's (1961) "client-centred" counseling psychology in the 1950s identified some key techniques for demonstrating empathic skills. These include suspending value judgements and showing a nonjudgemental stance, unconditional acceptance of another's view or feelings, regarding others as unique individuals capable of self-development and improvement, and active or reflective listening when the listener shows explicit signs of understanding through affirmative signals or checking for meaning through paraphrasing or nonthreatening inquiry.

Skills

Skills refers to practices and behavioural habits that reflect ICE. Bruner (1996) suggested that knowledge only becomes useful when it is transformed into consistent behavioural patterns or habits. Different forms of knowledge may interrelate or underpin them, but skills actually demonstrate whether someone has managed to translate internal attributes (e.g., awareness, sensitivity) into practice. Skills can be seen as the behavioural manifestations, expression, or reflection of inner or latent traits such as the ability to communicate with empathy or to demonstrate respect with nonverbal behaviour. Like knowledge, skills may be either culture generic or specific. Someone may have good skills in communicating with others from a specific culture or may have good general intercultural skills or both.

INTERCULTURAL EFFECTIVENESS AS A GENERIC ABILITY AND GRADUATE OUTCOME

Intercultural effectiveness can be seen as one of many generic or general abilities that might appropriately form the basis of progressive educational programs. In recent decades, other essential, universally important learning outcomes have been identified and broadly agreed on (Billings, 2003; Gibbons-Wood & Lange, 2000; Huitt, 1997). Those commonly identified include problem solving, critical analysis, social interaction, communication, information and knowledge management, and ethical decision making. In related work, Gardner (1993) has identified important attributes under the umbrella concept of "multiple intelligences" to complement more traditionally familiar and "testable" attributes such as linguistic, logical, and mathematical abilities. His constructs of interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence correspond closely with EQ and some essential parts of ICE.

The groupings and choices of targeted abilities generally relate to local needs and priorities, but there is increasing recognition of some universal principles that are necessary for supporting their development and measurement. These include a major role for systematic, structured, and criterion-based self-assessment (Alverno College Institute, 1994) to raise self-awareness about one's preferred and

nonpreferred ways of engaging in learning situations as well as personal strengths and areas on which to focus improvement efforts.

Despite such major conceptual advances during past decades, there has been relatively little change in prevailing approaches to teaching, learning, and assessment. Instead, there has been a continued focus on learning that relates to a lower order or “low road transfer” of learning (Fogarty, Perkins, & Barell, 1992). This is despite growing recognition and urgent demands to rethink education structures and priorities. Higher-order, transferable abilities, such as ICE, are often regarded as “soft skills” and therefore “too hard” to assess (Stone, 1999). This assumption needs to be challenged by developing a coherent conceptual framework that can guide the teaching, learning, and assessment of other generic abilities in mainstream programs.

A common finding from much of the work done so far in this area is the central importance of structured, systematic self-assessment as a means of implementing the reflective practices that underpin the development of higher-order abilities (Alverno College Institute, 1994; Lohrey, 1995). This mechanism may well form the basis of a conceptual schema that will allow greater integration of formative and summative assessment purposes and, in doing so, cater to the need to explicitly teach and assess higher-order abilities. A review of related literature suggests that this emphasis on raising and applying self-awareness is a major point of intersection with work done in intercultural communication and other overlapping areas such as “emotional intelligence” (Goleman, 1995) and “emotional literacy” (Steiner, 1997). Although self-awareness is often cited as a key ingredient in developing ICE, so far little has been offered by way of praxis or putting “theory into practice.” Future research may do well to synthesise these historically disparate fields by including self-awareness as a core element within any intercultural framework.

CONCLUSION

At the start of this article, the questions “What should internationalisation mean?” and “Why internationalise?” were raised. At the applied level, internationalisation needs to be interpreted in ways that have pragmatic value to university teachers—that is, it should mean whatever is most useful within the context of a range of concurrent priorities. This accords with the sentiments of Kuhn who, right to the end of his life, was adamant that theories and conceptual advances should be valued for their utility (Horgan, 1996). Exactly how academic teachers choose to (or not to) internationalise the student learning experience will need to take into account various contextual factors, including the following:

- the appropriateness of international content for particular subjects, courses, and the broader curriculum;
- the personal interests of both staff and students;

- departmental and organisational cultures;
- relevance to likely student vocational destinations;
- institutional priorities;
- available funding opportunities; and
- perceived areas of deficit in need of concerted attention.

Fullan (1991, 1993) had some useful advice when it comes to creating realistic expectations about educational reform. He emphasised the importance of aligning any change with the existing needs, interests, and priorities of those concerned. There is simply too much on people's agendas to keep piling up new, unrelated demands. Most, if not all, of the approaches advocated in this chapter will also help to address the need to develop more effective collaborative, critical, and communicatively versatile graduates. Fullan also highlights the need for clarity and realistic planning—he suggests assuming that it will take 3 to 5 years for specific innovations to take hold and even longer for institutional reform. The framework offered here may help to clarify some conceptual issues and choices and may assist in identifying which areas are most important and feasible to address first. These goals are important for the effective planning, implementation, and evaluation of change processes.

Much of this article has focused on addressing the need for greater conceptual clarity by synthesising prior research, theory, and empirical data to identify generic elements of ICE. To stand up to the scrutiny of psychometricians, it will also be necessary to

- construct related developmental scales for each of the elements of ICE,
- empirically establish their validity, and
- identify the interrelationships between these latent traits.

A number of recent advances in the availability of associated statistical modelling software and the required computer power are now widely accessible to assist more sophisticated approaches to these challenges. These include structural equation and Rasch modelling (e.g., Byrne, 2001; Rasch, 1960/1980). The detail of resulting frameworks will no doubt vary between disciplinary contexts, traditions, and needs. Whatever the local shape and form, they are necessary bases for both policy makers and practitioners to confidently plan, conduct, assess, and evaluate educational programs that demonstrably enhance ICE.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. (1995). Competitive frontiers: Cross-cultural management and the 21st century. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 19(4), 523-537.
- Adler, N. (1997). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western.

- Alverno College Institute. (1994). *Student assessment-as-learning at Alverno College*. Milwaukee, WI: Author.
- Arthur, W., Jr., & Bennett, W., Jr. (1995). The international assignee: The relative importance of factors perceived to contribute to success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 99-115.
- Balanyá, B., Doherty, A., Hoedeman, O., Ma'anit, A., & Wesselius, E. (1999, July 4). *WTO millennium bug: TNC control over global trade politics*. European Corporate Observatory. Retrieved from <http://www.xs4all.nl/~ceo/observer4/index.html#globalisation>
- Barker, A. (1998). Profile of action learning's principal pioneer—Reginald W. Revans. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 11(1), 9-22.
- Bennett, M. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(2), 179-195.
- Bennett, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Basic concepts in intercultural communication*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Billings, D. (2003). Generic cognitive abilities in higher education: An international analysis of skills sought by stakeholders. *Compare*, 33(3), 335-350.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook 1: cognitive domain*. London: Longman.
- Bolton, R. (1987). *People skills*. Brookvale, Australia: Simon & Schuster.
- Bowden, J., & Masters, G. (1993). *Implications for higher education of a competency-based approach to education and training* (Report for the Evaluations and Investigations Program, Department of Employment, Education and Training). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Braithwaite, D. (1998). Viewing persons with disability as a culture. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 147-153). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Byrne, B. N. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chen, G. (1997, January). *A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity*. Paper presented at the biennial convention of Pacific and Asian Communication Association, Honolulu, Hawaii. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408 634)
- Crainer, S. (1996, April 12). Interview with Reg Revans. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.mcb.co.uk/imc/news/bulletins/revans.htm>
- Cui, G., & van den Berg, S. (1991). Testing the construct validity of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 227-241.
- Damasio, A. (1996). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. London: Papermac.

- Davies, L. (1997). *Introduction to intercultural communication* (English B5 course notes). Nagoya University. Retrieved from <http://www.webcom.com/lbdavies/uni/97/nu/b5/definitions.html>
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Business Books.
- Engler, J., & Hunt, J. (2004). Preparing our students for work and citizenship in the global age. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(3), 197-2000.
- Eraut, M. (1998). Concepts of competence. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 12(2), 127.
- Fogarty, R., Perkins, D., & Barell, J. (1992). *How to teach for transfer*. Palatine, IL: Skylight Publishing.
- Fox, C. (1997). Authenticity of intercultural communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21(1), 85-103.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gibbons-Wood, D., & Lange, T. (2000). Developing core skills—lessons from Germany and Sweden. *Education and Training*, 42(1), 24-32.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Gudykunst, W. (1998). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guirdham, M. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. London: Macmillan.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Hamilton, S. (1998, March 17-19). *Setting the foundation for the internationalisation of Australian higher education*. Paper delivered to Education '98: The Industry Practitioners Forum, Sydney, Australia.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. L. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421-444.
- Hilgard, E., Atkinson, R., & Atkinson, R. (1979). *Introduction to psychology* (7th ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. London: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hong, C., Gibbons, P., & Schoch, H. (1999, December). Multinational corporations: Managing diversity. *Australian Certified Practising Accountant*. Retrieved from http://www.cpaonline.com.au/html/aa/9912/pg_aa9912_mgmt2.htm

- Horgan, J. (1996). *The end of science*. London: Little, Brown.
- Huitt, W. (1997, April 18). *The SCANS report revisited*. Paper delivered at the Fifth Annual Gulf South Business and Vocational Education Conference, Valdosta State University, GA. Retrieved from <http://valdosta.edu/~whuitt/psy702/student/scanspap.htm>
- Kealey, D. J. (1996). The challenge of international personnel selection. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 81-105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kelley, C., & Meyers, J. (1995). *CCAI: Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Knight, J. (1999, October 5). *Internationalizing the curriculum—a Canadian perspective*. Presented at a seminar for the International Development Program, Fremantle, Perth, Western Australia.
- Korten, D. (1999). *The post-corporate world: Life after capitalism*. Annandale, Australia: Pluto.
- Lohrey, A. (1995). *A report on transferability in relation to the key competencies*. Sydney, Australia: Centre for Workplace Communication and Culture University of Technology.
- Macquarie Dictionary* (3rd ed.). (1997). North Ryde, Australia: Macquarie University.
- Majors, R. (1991). The nonverbal elements of a gay culture. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 163-170). Wadsworth, CA: Belmont.
- Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
- Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G., & Seng, M. (2003). The third wave: Future trends in international education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(3), 90-99.
- McCabe, L. (1997). Global perspective development. *Education*, 118(1), 41-46.
- McKenna, P. (2000). Globalising education: Trends and applications. *Educational Review*, 52(2), 217.
- Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. R. (1985). The dimensions of expatriate acculturation: A review. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 39-48.
- Mestel, R. (1996). Behind the mask. *New Scientist*, 150(2027), 10.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education*, 32(1), 3-24.
- Miller, G. (1984). *Psychology: The science of mental life*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin.
- Minsky, M. (1988). *The society of mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- National Training Board. (1992). *National competency standards: Policy and guidelines* (2nd ed.). Canberra, Australia: NTB Ltd.

- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1988). *Global teacher, global learner*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Queensland Department of Education. (1994). *Cultural understandings as the eighth key competency* (Report to the Commonwealth Department of Employment Education and Training). Canberra, Australia: Author.
- Rasch, G. (1980). *Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1960)
- Revans, R. (1987). *Action learning in brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.imc.org.uk/imc/action.htm>
- Richards, T. (1994). *Today's demands for global awareness: The community college dimension*. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/00000000b/80/25/df/7a.pdf (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED381209)
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rosen, R. (2000). *Global literacies: National cultures and business leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rowe, K., & Hill, P. (1996). Assessing, recording and reporting students' educational progress: The case for profiles. *Assessment in Education*, 3(3), 309-331.
- Ruben, B. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group and Organization Studies*, 1(3), 334-354.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 185-211.
- Samovar, L., & Porter, R. (1991). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Saul, J. R. (1997). *The unconscious civilization*. Melbourne, Australia: Penguin.
- Scales, P. (1999). Reducing risks and building developmental assets: Essential actions for promoting adolescent health. *The Journal of School Health*, 69(3), 113-119.
- Sorrells, K. (1998). On the past and the future of intercultural relations study, gifts of wisdom: An interview with Dr Edward T. Hall. *The Edge: The E-Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 1(3). Retrieved from <http://kumo.swcp.com/biz/theedge/intvhall.htm>
- Steiner, C. (1997). *Achieving emotional literacy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Stone, N. (1999, December). Essential abilities revisited. *Education Quarterly*, pp. 44-46.
- Talbot, M. (2004). Monkey see, monkey do: A critique of the competency model in graduate medical education. *Medical Education*, 38, 587-592.
- Teichler, U. (1999). Higher education policy and the world of work: Changing conditions and challenges. *Higher Education Policy*, 12, 285-312.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1992, April 15). *Cross-cultural face-negotiation: An analytical overview*. Paper delivered to the Pacific Region Forum on Business and

- Management Communication, David See-Chai Lam Centre for International Communication, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.cic.sfu.ca/forum/ting-too.html>
- Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Tucker, M. (2000). *International assessment and development service*. Retrieved from <http://www.tuckerintl.com/general/products/IntlAssessment1.html>
- Wiseman, R., & Koester, J. (1993). (Eds.). *Intercultural communication competence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nick Stone was a lecturer/consultant at the Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, at the time of writing. He has since moved to the School of Rural Health (at the same university), where he is involved in interprofessional learning initiatives at state and national levels. He has a long-standing interest in promoting interdisciplinary perspectives and intercultural competence across all sectors and levels of education and training. He is completing a PhD dissertation entitled "Assessing Intercultural Effectiveness in Management."